

Attorney Docket No. 40129/07301 (1403)

**REMARKS****I. INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1-24 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added. In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the above-identified claims are allowable.

**II. THE 35 U.S.C. §103(a) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN**

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,394,354 to Wilz, Sr. et al. ("Wilz") in view of U.S. Pat. App. No. 2005/0197892 to Bilibin et al. ("Bilibin"). (See 4/6/06 Office Action, p. 2).

Wilz discloses an Internet-based system and method for routing, tracking, and delivering packages. (See Wilz, Abstract). Packages are provided with bar codes containing URLs and zip code information, which may be scanned by a bar code reader to effect routing and tracking of the packages. (See id.). Specifically, each package is logged into a database management system, located on a server, by a package login procedure. (See Wilz, Col. 26, ll. 16-20). In this procedure, the server is accessed by reading a predesignated URL-encoded bar code symbol specifying its address on the Internet, package related information is entered via the internet, a custom bar code symbol label encoded with a corresponding URL is created and printed, and the label is applied to the package. (See Wilz, Col. 26, ll. 16-31). The database management system may contain a number of fields pertaining to the package, including a package identification number, a shipper identification number, destination information, delivery instructions, etc. (See Wilz, Col. 26, l. 54 - Col. 27, l. 22). As each package is transported, its bar code is scanned at package routing subsystems through which it moves, and location information of the package is updated with each scan. (See Wilz, Col. 29, ll. 27-51). Package related information may be viewed by reading the corresponding URL-encoded bar code symbols into an Internet browser program using a bar code scanner. (See Wilz, Col. 24, ll. 13-17).

Bilibin describes a system for determining origin and destination rating zone identifiers corresponding to parcel carriers using an origin postal code and a destination postal code as input. (See Bilibin, ¶ [0009]). In the system, package tracking

Attorney Docket No. 40129/07301 (1403)

is performed using one of a carrier tracking number and a system tracking number, which are unique numbers assigned by a carrier and generated internally by the system, respectively. (See Bilibin, ¶¶ [0412]-[0414]).

Claim 1 of the present invention recites a method for providing a user with a personalized shipment system which includes the steps of “determining whether the destination data is in a machine language” and “translating, when the destination data is not in a machine language, the destination data into machine language destination data” and “providing the tracking data regarding shipment progress of the item in response to a request, wherein the tracking data is provided using only the user identifier and the destination data included in the request.”

The Examiner maintains that the step of creating and printing a custom bar code symbol label in the login procedure of Wilz is equivalent to “determining whether the destination data is in a machine language” and “translating, when the destination data is not in a machine language, the destination data into machine language.” (See 4/6/06 Office Action, p. 3). However, in Wilz, the label containing destination data is always created in machine language (i.e., a bar code), and thus no determination need be made. The Examiner has stated that a determination is inherent, however it is respectfully submitted that it is the process of converting human input into the bar code which is inherent and eliminates the need for the determination to take place. The system described by Wilz does not allow the user to enter non-human language input and cannot create the bar code without such input. Furthermore, it is unclear why the Examiner considers the converting step to be conditional. (See 4/6/06 Office Action, p. 9). The bar code is always created and the information required to create the bar code is input using a human language. The system may determine whether the input is valid, but the system would never determine whether the input was itself a human language. Therefore, the converting is not conditional. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Wilz neither discloses nor suggests “determining whether the destination data is in a machine language” and “translating, when the destination data is not in a machine language, the destination data into machine language,” as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner also notes that Wilz fails to disclose or suggest “providing the tracking data regarding shipment progress of the item in response to a request,

Attorney Docket No. 40129/07301 (1403)

wherein the tracking data is provided using only the user identifier and the destination data included in the request” and attempts to cure this deficiency with Bilibin. (See 4/6/06 Office Action, page 3). Initially, it is respectfully submitted that Bilibin does not cure the previously described deficiencies of Wilz. Specifically, neither Wilz nor Bilibin, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests “determining whether the destination data is in a machine language” and “translating, when the destination data is not in a machine language, the destination data into machine language,” as recited in claim 1.

In addition, Bilibin does not teach or suggest providing tracking data “using only the user identifier and the destination data included in the request.” Bilibin describes the use of a user ID and a package table, but these are database elements and there is no mention of their use in a tracking procedure. Bilibin explicitly states that in order to track a particular package, “a Shipper identifies a tracking number for that package to the System and requests that the System report the status of the package.” (See Bilibin, ¶ [0412]). Only the tracking number is used, and the user ID and destination data have no role whatsoever in the tracking method taught by Bilibin. Furthermore, even if the package table were accessible, the shipper would still need to be logged-in using the user ID and a password. Clearly, this is not the same as using only a user identifier and destination data to access tracking data. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Bilibin does not teach or suggest providing tracking data “using only the user identifier and the destination data included in the request,” as recited in claim 1.

Based on the reasons described above, it is respectfully submitted that neither Wilz nor Bilibin, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests “determining whether the destination data is in a machine language” and “translating, when the destination data is not in a machine language, the destination data into machine language destination data” and “providing the tracking data regarding shipment progress of the item in response to a request, wherein the tracking data is provided using only the user identifier and the destination data included in the request,” as recited in claim 1. Because claims 2-12 depend from and therefore include all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable.

Attorney Docket No. 40129/07301 (1403)

Claim 13 recites "a first shipment processing arrangement... determining whether the destination data is in a machine language and, when the destination data is not in a machine language, the first shipment processing arrangement translates the destination data into the machine language destination data," and "tracking data...provided by the second computing arrangement in response to a request, wherein the tracking data is provided using only the user identifier and the destination data included in the request." Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 13 should be withdrawn. Because claims 14-24 depend from and therefore include all the limitations of claim 13, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable.


Attorney Docket No. 40129/07301 (1403)

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and arguments, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 20, 2006

  
By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Oleg F. Kaplun (Reg. No. 48,559)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP  
150 Broadway, Suite 702  
New York, NY 10038  
Tel: (212) 619-6000  
Fax: (212) 619-0276